



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/660,460	06/07/96	LUBWIG	L VCOB-001/030
			EXAMINER
			ELIOTT, E
			ART UNIT
			PAPER NUMBER
			4
			2317
			DATE MAILED: 10/10/96
COOLEY GODWARD CASTRO HUDDLESON & TATUM FIVE PALO ALTO SQUARE 3000 EL CAMINO REAL PALO ALTO CA 94306			

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.
COMMISIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

This application has been examined Responsive to communication filed on 9-12-96 This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), 0 days from the date of this letter.
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

1. Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892.
2. Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
3. Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449.
4. Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152.
5. Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474.
6.

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

1. Claims 1-25 are pending in the application.

Of the above, claims _____ are withdrawn from consideration.

2. Claims 1, 10-15, 21-25 have been cancelled.

3. Claims _____ are allowed.

4. Claims 2-9, 16-20 are rejected.

5. Claims _____ are objected to.

6. Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

7. This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes.

8. Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.

9. The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on _____. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are acceptable; not acceptable (see explanation or Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948).

10. The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on _____, has (have) been approved by the examiner; disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).

11. The proposed drawing correction, filed _____, has been approved; disapproved (see explanation).

12. Acknowledgement is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has been received not been received been filed in parent application, serial no. _____; filed on _____.

13. Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11: 453 O.G. 213.

14. Other

Part III DETAILED ACTION

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

Claims 2, 5, 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Crawford et al. "VIDEOMATIC SWITCHING: SYSTEMS AND SERVICES".

As per claim 2, Crawford teaches a teleconferencing system comprising:

a plurality of workstations having monitor, AV capture and reproduction capabilities [fig.1]

a first network providing data path [p.39 col.1 last paragraph - "Data Switching"];

a second network providing AV path [p.39 col.1 - "Video/Audio Switch"]; and

managing the reproduction of video and audio [signaling] by utilizing the first network [p.39 col.1 last paragraph - "data switching ... must accomodate ... application data and videotelephony signaling data."]

Crawford does not specifically disclose a data conference manager for managing a data conference and a AV conference manager for managing videoconference. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have a data and AV manager in Crawford system because it would have enable integration of the data and AV for conferencing.

As per claim 5, Crawford teaches multiplexing AV and data signals [p.39 col.2 last paragraph].

As per claim 16, it is rejected under similar rationales as for claim 2 above.

As per claim 17, Crawford teaches using digital and analog for the AV signal [p.39 col.1 1st paragraph "analog switching and transmission in the local area and the corresponding digital techniques for the wide area.]

As per claim 18, Crawford teaches multiplexing the AV and data on the same physical path [p.39 col.2 last paragraph].

Claims 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Crawford et al. "VIDEOMATIC SWITCHING: SYSTEMS AND SERVICES" and further in view of Goolcharan US patent 5,283,637.

As per claim 6, Crawford does not specifically teach using twisted pair. Goolcharan teaches using unshield twisted pair to transmit video. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to transmit the AV over twisted pair because it would have enabled the system to use existing wiring infrastructure and dispensed the need for special wiring for transmitting the AV signal.

As per claim 7, Goolcharan teaches using existing twisted pair wiring. Hence, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to use the used portion of a four-pair wiring installation if the building has it.

Claims 8-9 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Crawford et al. "VIDEOMATIC SWITCHING: SYSTEMS AND SERVICES" and further in view of McFarland US patent 5,408,526.

As per claims 8-9, Crawford teaches router [fig.1 Central Office] for routing the AV signal among participants. Crawford

does not specifically discloses optimizing the routing of the AV signal. McFarland teaches to optimzing conference call base on cost, available path/routes [Abstract]. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to opitimze the routing of the signal because it would have improved performance and reduced cost.

Claims 19-20 are rejected under similar rationale as for claims 8-9 above.

Claims 3-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Crawford et al. "VIDEOMATIC SWITCHING: SYSTEMS AND SERVICES" and further in view of Vin et al. "Multimedia Conferencing in the Etherphone Environment".

As per claims 3, Crawford does not specifically teach the data network and AV signal network having physically different path. Crawford discloses modulating the AV and data signal onto a fiber optic line; the AV and data are logically separate. Vin teaches a conferencing system having Ethernet network for data & control, and a physically separate network for transmitting analog AV signal [fig.1] to add video+audio to existing Ethernet network. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill the art to have physically separate path for data and the AV signal because

it would have enable the system to transmit AV signal in existing data network without modification to the data network.

As per claim 4, Crawford teaches using digital and analog for the AV signal [p.39 col.1 1st paragraph "analog switching and transmission in the local area and the corresponding digital techniques for the wide area.]

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Champa US patent 5,315,633 teaches a switch for video conference.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dung Dinh whose telephone number is (703) 305-9655. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:00 AM - 4:30 PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas Lee can be reached at (703) 305-9717. The fax phone number for this group is (703) 308-5359.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.


D Dinh
Patent Examiner
Sept. 30, 1996